

## MINUTES

### THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION ON GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

Wednesday, April 7, 2010

10:00 a.m.

Room 544, Legislative Office Building

The Legislative Commission on Global Climate Change (LCGCC) met Wednesday, April 7, 2010 in Room 544 of the Legislative Office Building. Co-Chair Mr. John L. W. Garrou presided. (*SEE ATTACHMENT: Members and Guests Present.*)

Co-Chair Garrou thanked the staff for an excellent job “synthesizing” various views into a comprehensible draft report. Furthermore, he thanked the Commission members for providing their thinking and input to bring the report along. He said he would like the Commission to produce a report which reflected the views of a majority of the members and would provide proposals for action by the General Assembly. He said that today’s meeting would not produce any official votes. Those votes would come at the May 6 meeting

Commission Counsel Tim Dodge said the opening presentations with regard to the state building code were requested by members of the Commission. He said the discussion of the draft report would come following the presentations. Mr. Dodge pointed out that the information was available on the Commission website:

<http://www.ncleg.net/gascripts/DocumentSites/browseDocsite.asp?nID-14>

On motion from Co-Chair Harrison and seconded by Dr. Eggers, the minutes from December 8, 2008, January 13, 2009, and March 15, 2010 were approved. (*SEE ATTACHMENTS: Minutes.*)

### Presentations

Billy Hinton, Building Code Consultant with the N. C. Department of Insurance provided the Commission with the code provisions proposed for 2012. (*SEE ATTACHMENT: 2012 NC Energy Conservation Code Update.*) The work on the Code proposal was helped by grant money from the U. S. Department of Energy, which came through the N. C. Energy office.

The 2012 Building Code is modeled on the international code of 2009 with specific North Carolina provisions. A public hearing on the new proposals will come in June; written public comment must be in by July 16 and the Building Code Council will meet in September to consider final adoption. While the new Code would go into effect September 1, 2011 there will be an overlap with the current code until January 1, 2012.

Any substantive change brought on by public comments would require another public hearing in September or December 2010 and delay implementation by as much as six months.

In accepting the grant, North Carolina had to agree to develop and adopt an energy conservation plan that was 30% more efficient than the International Energy Conservation Code of 2006. Other provisions require code enforcement mechanisms for building designers, contractors, and for code enforcement officials to be provided with training and technical assistance. From this, North Carolina is to develop a model code for the Southeast and Mid Atlantic states.

The new code has increased requirements for wall and ceiling insulation, window efficiency and leakage tests for heating and air conditioning duct work.

Much of the training money is expected to come from American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds.

North Carolina is also working to create a Green Construction Code for the State based on the International Code Council (ICC) Green Building code.

Co-Chair Representative Harrison asked if the codes could be ignored or changed, or how the process worked. Mr. Hinton said the codes are developed nationally. Then the North Carolina Building Code Council examines the various parts of the proposed code and decides which portions can be followed, or what things need to be changed to fit North Carolina. Thus, there is no federally mandated building code. Mr. Hinton agreed with Representative Harrison that the Green Building Code planned for North Carolina had incentives for adherence to the code. Mr. Hinton said that there had been little or no resistance to the green code.

Dr. Smith complimented the progress being made. He asked Mr. Hinton about opposition to verification of heating/air conditioning systems. Mr. Hinton said most of the problems seemed to be in the contractual arrangements between builders and owners.

The ICC meeting will be held in Charlotte in October and the actions taken there with regard to code provisions will be part of the 2012 Code.

Senator Stein asked if North Carolina was tracking efforts being taken by other states to make sure we are not missing some good ideas. Mr. Hinton said that North Carolina was one of the leaders in code adoption. He said that code adoption is up to the states and a lot of states lagged behind North Carolina. He said that the leaders in code development were California, Florida, and North Carolina.

Mr. Hinton said that some of the more contentious provisions could be included as an option, but the decision was made to go after the aspects that are apt to be more universally accepted. He said that even with the mandate of a 30% level increase in efficiency, the North Carolina code had a higher level, somewhere between 30% and 40%. Senator Stein commended the move toward a green code, as a standard to reach and as a method of charting which mechanisms are truly green.

Ms. Choi said that there is a feeling in some circles that the code is not the problem, but the enforcement is. She wanted additional information about the enforcement segments of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) grant. Mr. Hinton said that the enforcement tools were being developed by the DOE and those tools would be passed down to the states to check the responses. He said residential and commercial buildings would be inspected and third party contractors would verify the results. Ms. Choi asking if counties will have energy codes. Mr. Hinton said that there was not a single energy code certificate, but the energy code was part of the various other code provisions, such as, lighting, heating, plumbing etc.

Representative Wilkins asked if the industry was ahead of the times in terms of more energy efficient windows. Mr. Hinton said that the product to meet and exceed the proposed standards was on the market, and use was a matter of choice. He said that starter homes would benefit from the new window standards and higher priced homes have been using the higher efficiency windows already.

Dr. Everett said that the proposals as presented will also come before the Energy Policy Council. He asked if the code provisions were approved by the Energy Policy Council, how could we measure what level of energy efficiency had been achieved? He mentioned the 30% figure as contained in the presentation. Mr. Hinton said that the actual level would be between 30% and 40%. New buildings following the code would begin to contribute to that efficiency, and so would modifications made to existing buildings. He said that the “rehab code” would be examined to determine what energy requirements could be added there.

Dr. Everett asked what would happen in case of challenges to the code such that the level would reach only 20%? Would the DOE grant be affected? Mr. Hinton would only say that Governor Perdue had given assurances that the level would be met and there had not been a discussion of grant return.

In response to Mr. Slocum, Mr. Hinton said that building materials would be a part of the Green Building Code. He said that the code would address sustainable materials.

Next Aranzasu Lascrain, Research Assistant for Co-Chair Representative Harrison, made a presentation on energy efficient building codes. (***SEE ATTACHMENT: Opportunities and Prospects for Adopting Energy Efficient Building Codes for North Carolina.***)

Buildings, commercial, and residential account for one-third of the green house gas emissions in North Carolina. Thus, stricter codes are not only the fastest way to reduce green house gases, but the cheapest too. Additionally, energy efficiency provides the lower cost per kilowatt hour when compared to energy production sources ranging from wind to fossil fuel.

She said that North Carolina would avoid nearly 60 trillion BTUs of primary annual energy use by 2030 and annual CO2 emissions of about 4.2 metric tons, if the code revisions are adopted.

Ms. Lascrain continued by outlining various activities related to energy efficiency that have begun and those which are in the planning process.

Co-Chair Representative Harrison asked Mr. Hinton if there was any delay in adopting the pending directives since time was being devoted to tailor certain parts, specifically for North Carolina. He said that the ICC had improved its delivery time of the codes by about six months. He said that the North Carolina amendments were usually dealt with in a three to six month window, but perhaps that work could be sped up.

Portions of Ms. Lascrain’s presentation made reference to three provisions of the Climate Change Advisory Group (CAPAG) report, which the LCGCC had endorsed previously.

Dr. Everett asked about the status of House Bill 1443: Green Building Code. Co-Chair Representative Harrison said that the bill had been introduced, but not considered.

Ms. Tompkins asked what North Carolina's top two energy needs are. Ms. Lascurain said energy loading due to winter heating and summer cooling was one; the second was green house gasses and air quality.

Co-Chair Garrou then directed the meeting to a review of the draft report as prepared by the staff. Staff Counsel Tim Dodge had preliminary remarks. He noted the paragraph at the top of **page 13** had been added to reflect the view of some of the members regarding the subject of climate change. He said a letter to the Commission from several members was included as Appendix D.

Mr. Dodge referred to **pages 17-65** as work in progress. The pages between **page 65 and 75** are findings, new to the report. **Pages 75-85** contain the recommendations and the ideas for future action. From **85 to 108** are the legislative proposals. Mr. Dodge said that none of the proposals have been reviewed by the agencies which might be involved in any proposed action.

Co-Chair Garrou asked that primary comments on pages **1 through 64** be submitted by email and the discussion begin with **page 65**.

Mr. Dodge called attention to the reference to findings by the U. S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP). He said that the ten overall findings, including the five specific to the Southeast, are all included rather than make a selection prior to the draft preparation.

Mr. Slocum said he did not support including the USGCRP findings in the final report. Dr. Smith asked for a clarification of Mr. Slocum's position. Mr. Slocum said that the report was predicated on the position that the science on climate change is settled and that CO2 is the villain. This is not his position on either point and therefore he said he had trouble supporting any of the findings from USGCRP.

Dr. Everett asked for clarification. It was his belief that the Commission had approved these three findings by resolution:

1. Climate change is real
2. Human activity is a factor in that change
3. The Commission should move forward to address the issues faced by the state.

Further Dr. Everett said that he believed that the 15 Findings by the USGCRP had not been acted upon by the Commission. Co-Chair Garrou and Mr. Dodge agreed that was the case. Mr. Dodge reiterated that the entire list of findings was included rather than do a piece meal selection from the list. Commission Counsel Jeff Hudson said that the intent was to be as inclusive as possible with the comments and try to reconcile the contradictory comments and incorporate those into the draft. He repeated that the Commission had only acted on the three findings on February 8, 2008 and the 17 recommendations approved on February 22, 2007. **(PAGE 75)**

Dr. Riggs said he recalled the three reasons for the Commission were:

1. Learn how N. C. can take advantage of energy opportunities
2. How does N. C. adapt to future changes
3. Learn what the rest of the community (world) is doing about climate change

He said that the findings were not bogus, that he supports them, and that he disagrees with Mr. Slocum. He said that the findings provide the national and international evaluations of what is being done. Co-Chair Garrou said he agreed.

Mr. Glaser said the findings were a bit “misleading”. He said that he did not have trouble with the findings being included, but not with the phrase “generally endorse” as written in the draft, since he said the Commission did not openly endorse or discuss the findings. Co-Chair Garrou said the goal was to present a report that the majority of the Commission could agree upon. He said there will be some portions that even the majority would have some objection to. Mr. Glaser said the introduction should include language that said “while some members of the Commission support these findings, the USGCRP findings have not been openly discussed and debated.”

Mr. Howard remembered a lot of discussion had gone into crafting the language that is contained in the three findings that were approved by the Commission in 2008. He said that while he might be sold on the concept that the climate is warming, he is not sold that man is responsible for the warming. He recalled a presentation made by Dr. Riggs, which pointed to the cyclical nature of warming and cooling trends in which the warming time period was so short it was almost vertical. He said he could not support the tenet that climate change is primarily human-induced.

Mr. Slocum said there is a consensus that the climate is warming, but the cause is the issue. He said he had no argument with the precept of adaptation, but could not accept that warming is due primarily to human causes.

Dr. Riggs said while he felt the concept of human impact could be argued, he said “we can back off on pointing the fingers why” as long as the Commission maintained the focus that climate is changing. He said one or two of the draft bills took into consideration how to monitor the change and how fast it is happening.

Senator Stein said it appeared the major question in the USGCRP finding is the word “primarily” with respect to human impact on warming. He said he considered the remainder of the findings reasonable and suggested that removing the word or adding a footnote would be a way to achieve the purpose.

Mr. Glaser said he felt the findings could not be edited since they were findings of people other than the Commission. He said the Commission could note these findings had not been discussed, or that they were findings of other people.

Mr. Urlaub said that the vast majority of the 15 findings looked okay to him and from the discussion he recognized the amount of work and discussion that had gone into reaching the consensus on the three findings the Commission had approved previously. He said the 15 findings are significant and that over the four years of the Commission’s meetings a majority of the information brought before the Commission supported the USGCRP findings. He asked if there was a method by which a subset of the members could endorse the 15 findings while another subset objected to them. Co-Chair Garrou said he would like a report that could be presented with support from a majority of the Commission members. He said he preferred not to have a report with a series of caveats included. He said he felt that the report should be accepted all in all by the Commission. He said he believed that was the most efficient method and would provide the most impact for the report. At the same time he recognized the value of recognizing the opposing views of members such as Mr. Slocum.

Representative Wilkins noted there is a month to examine the draft. He advised that the Commission should not allow objections to the 15 findings to erode the work that had gone into the agreements reached in the three findings that the Commission adopted. He continued by saying that his newspaper experience would lead him to examine each adjective and adverb, but that the adjectives and adverbs were really the problem. He reiterated that the work of four and a half years should not be eroded.

Co-Chair Garrou said the word “primarily” did not have to be included in the endorsement of the USGCRP findings. He said that the issues voiced by the members could be dealt with in the Commission’s report.

Dr. Eggers asked if there was anything in the draft that had not been presented to the Commission at one time or another. Mr. Dodge said that the material had been available to members and included in presentations, i.e. David McKnight’s information and several Commission members had referenced the USGCRP findings in the comments forwarded to the staff. Other presentations were mentioned directly or alluded to so that staff could determine the identity of the presentation. Mr. Dodge said discussions with the Co-Chairs also prompted some material to be included in the draft.

Co-Chair Garrou suggested that the Commission direct the staff to put the 15 findings in language that conforms to what the Commission had agreed to in its three adopted findings. Thus, the staff could eliminate any language that is inconsistent with those three findings. In his opinion, the first two findings provide a basis for the Commission to move forward with its recommendations. The staff language would, of course, be subject to final approval by the Commission.

Dr. Eggers said since the first two Commission findings did have full approval of the group, it would be detrimental to open those up for alteration. She said that it was not likely that there would be a complete consensus on the final report.

Co-Chair Garrou directed the staff to develop conforming language consistent with the Commission’s core findings.

Mr. Peele asked if the same principle would apply to any material other than the USGCRP findings. Co-Chair Garrou said that should be the case. Further, the staff is urged to provide the edited draft to give members sufficient time to review the product prior to the meeting. Co-Chair Garrou also assured members that no one was foreclosed from submitting additional remarks.

Dr. Smith asked if copies of the draft could be provided that would reflect what the changes are vis-à-vis the first draft. Mr. Hudson said that the changes would be identifiable. He said that the major inconsistency between the Commission’s adopted findings and the 15 from the USGCRP was with the first finding from the latter and its reference to the language “primarily human-induced.”

Dr. Andrews said that a lot of time had passed since the adoption of the USGCRP and that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) had adopted an even stronger position than what is included. He said that it was up to the Commission whether to adopt the stronger position, but that it should be discussed, debated and perhaps acted upon.

Mr. Cecich said this was the second such national research report. He participated in writing the first one issued in 2000. He urged that the focus remain on the impact of

climate change. He said that the impact findings were well-researched and were pertinent to North Carolina.

Dr. Boyles asked, first, if there is possibility of separating portions of the report for discussion and vote? Second, how strict a deadline did the Commission face? Co-Chair Garrou deferred to staff. Mr. Hudson said that the Commission is due to expire as of October 1, 2010 and could wait until that time to make a report. Logistically, legislative members of the Commission and the staff will be concentrating on the Session, which begins May 12<sup>th</sup> and will be dealing with Session actions for several months thereafter. He said that the ultimate goal is to present a report to the General Assembly, and waiting would miss the opportunity to present the report to the 2010 Session. Dr. Boyles asked if the discussion could be held now? Co-Chair Garrou said he had hoped that would be the case when he asked for discussion from the members earlier.

Dr. Eggers said while the collected material had come to the members recently, it was not new information being seen for the first time. As to views opposing the position on “human” causation of climate change, she said that she did not see any scientific support in the draft for that opposition. She asked if findings had been sent in to be included. Mr. Slocum said there was information provided by Dr. Michaels and that there was a large body of scientific research that disagrees with the premise that global warming is human induced. Dr. Eggers asked if Mr. Slocum had sent in any of this information to be considered or included in the draft. Mr. Slocum said that he would glad to provide any information that the staff would like to have. He said that he didn’t think it would do much good, but he would be glad to provide it. Dr. Eggers said that the process had provided for information to be submitted and in her opinion the Commission could not wait past May.

Co-Chair Garrou said that this is a large Commission with disparate views and “no matter if we issue the report in October or October three years from now” there would be issues and dissenting views. He doubted the Commission could get an extension if one was requested and that an extension would be embarrassing and finally that it was time to “get on with it.”

Ms. Choi asked if there was a need to adopt additional findings since there is already a consensus of the Commission on the three adopted in the February 11, 2008 resolution. Mr. Dodge said those three findings were very general and had brought about discussion about the need for more information to clarify including the other findings.

Dr. Riggs reminded the Commission of the three aims mentioned in the establishing legislation, one of which is to review the status on a national and international basis. He said something needed to be included to reflect that.

Dr. Smith said he was sensitive to the fact that everyone in the room did not agree with the draft verbatim, but he felt the additional findings were necessary—perhaps with some “nuances” prepared by the next meeting. He said he did not want to see the report stripped away without some additional findings about what the Commission had experienced.

Senator Stein said it is important for the Legislature to have some idea of the potential impact on the state and translate findings into specifics for North Carolina.

Ms. Tompkins said that the three adopted findings had already been watered down. She said that the Commission should present a report as soon as possible.

Dr. Eggers said that it is the responsibility of the Commission to include information from all the scientists that have been before the panel regarding climate change effects on North Carolina. Further she said that it is part of the service obligation of the Commission to convey that information so it can be used. Mr. Urlaub said he agreed. He said if the Commission had not discussed the points as thoroughly as some would like and there might be disagreement on that but there is a duty for the Commission to reflect what the group has learned from all the expertise that has been presented. He said that the discussion would continue. "The climate isn't going to suddenly stop changing, the day after we finish this report."

Co-Chair Garrou said he would take it as the majority view that the supplemental findings with the previously discussed modifications would be included in the final report. Then he moved the Commission onto the Recommendations for Future Consideration (Page 77).

Mr. Dodge said the Recommendations were basically what were presented at the March 15 meeting. He noted there were some exceptions:

**Page 79 rephrasing in #11 and #14**

**Page 80 rephrasing in #20 and #26**

**Page 80 #21 and #22 are new items**

**Page 81 #27 is new & #32 was re-phrased**

Mr. Peele asked if all the recommendations from Commission members were included? Mr. Dodge said after discussion with the Chairs that some items which were too controversial, or had not been discussed fully, were not included.

Mr. Glaser complimented the work of the staff in compiling the draft. He asked that #27 on page 81 with regard to a low emission vehicle program be omitted since there were new federal emission standards for all 50 states. Co-Chair Representative Harrison asked that the item remain in the report until the full impact of the Environmental Protection Agency ruling can be assessed.

There was discussion that the future recommendations sections include an introductory statement explaining that the list reflected the ideas of various members of the Commission.

Mr. Dodge called attention to the introduction of the draft which stated that the report did not reflect unanimity "among Commission members on the selected findings, recommendations, or legislative proposals." That and other language on page 14 of the draft was deemed sufficient to reflect that disparate views and ideas were found within members of the Commission.

Co-Chair Garrou asked to consider the Legislative Recommendations individually. (Page 85 and FF.)

1. *Calling for a Permanent Climate Change Commission.*
2. *DENR Develop Adaptation Strategy:*

Dr. Riggs recommended two advisory panels to work with DENR, in concert, concerning the adaptation strategy. He said too little use is made of the scientific expertise within the University of North Carolina (UNC) system. One of the panels would



involve other state and federal agency stakeholders in the issue. The other would include technical and scientific experts in the UNC system.

He proposed a change in language concerning shorelines to make it more general in terms of managing the various ecosystems, when it comes to potential sea level rise. Dr. Andrews agreed with Dr. Riggs's points. He said that the issue of climate change is being recognized for the wider social scientific impacts. Dr. Eggers agreed and Dr. Boyles suggested that other universities in the State could be tapped for involvement. **(DR. RIGGS' WRITTEN COMMENTS ARE INCLUDED IN THE ATTACHMENTS)**

Dr. Boyles said the education and outreach component of climate change might fit into this particular section. Mr. Dodge agreed that this was a good point and a good place to include this.

Dr. Riggs made a general comment concerning the short time frame.

Mr. Hudson reiterated that none of the legislative proposals had been considered by the agencies involved and that all of the drafts would receive a great deal more scrutiny. For now, he said they should be considered as concepts.

### *3 Green Energy Study:*

Ms. Choi suggested adding the term "cost effective" to references of the green energy policy. Dr. Riggs said that a reference to "wind energy" be expanded to include all types of energy from solar to ocean current and not limit it to wind energy alone.

Mr. Urlaub said past experience would show that asking the Utilities Commission to act on such a massive group of issues on such a quick turn around (Dec, 1, 2010) might not accomplish much. Further, he said some of the sections seem to overlap jurisdiction between the Utilities Commission and the Energy Policy Council.

Co-Chair Representative Harrison cautioned about using the term "cost effective" as suggested by Ms. Choi. Mr. Urlaub also raised the issues of subsidies for traditional and non-traditional sources of energy and how that impacts costs and cost effectiveness.

Dr. Everett said the list reminded him of an earlier list which was submitted to the Utilities Commission and the Utilities Commission essentially said, "We'll do whatever the General Assembly wants us to do." He said he agreed with Mr. Urlaub that action on the recommendations would take a while.

### *4 Carbon Offsets*

Mr. Glaser said he wished to see a "cost impact" added to the title as regarding the "feasibility and advisability" of carbon offset. Dr. Riggs suggested adding to the title "agricultural lands, forest land, wetlands, coastal waters" Dr. Eggers agreed.

Mr. Wooten said the term "feasibility" covers cost impacts, which he considers a very wide area.

### *5 .Funds for Monitoring.*

### *6. Climate Change Long-Range Planning*

Dr. Riggs assured the impact of emissions would affect river flooding, shoreline erosion, and coastal storm impact and barrier island dynamics.

Mr. Slocum asked for an example of an activity that would not have an impact under these provisions. Co-Chair Garrou believes this proposal would have people applying to carry out activities where there is no way to monitor those activities. He said he had personal reservations. Dr. Andrews suggested that the intent is to provide something akin to environmental impact statements. He said climate change should be considered in future projects both in terms of mitigation and adaptation. Dr. Riggs gave the example of the money scheduled to be spent for bridge and road projects on Highway 12 down the Outer Banks which is considered to last a hundred years. He said the islands would not be there in a hundred years if there is a one meter rise in the sea level. He said a recent terminal groin study and a beach and inlet management plan do not take sea level rise into consideration.

Co-Chair Garrou was concerned that a private company might seek a permit, but could not know if their plan might be permitted if it is determined their project could have an impact on green house gasses.

Mr. Slocum said he could not think of an activity that would not have an impact on climate change. Dr. Eggers agreed with Mr. Slocum's analysis, and she asked for someone to defend the opposite position.

Dr. Boyles said it might be easy to determine if an activity impacts climate change, but it may be more difficult to determine if there is a contribution to increased green house gasses.

Mr. Hudson said the staff would work to frame the members' issues with the draft. As he put it, it's one thing to assess the contribution a project might have on climate change and another thing to assess that project's impact on green house gasses. He said that with guidance from the Co-Chairs, the staff would seek to divide the two aspects for later consideration.

Mr. Howard said he did not expect the same level of expertise in the agencies who would be reviewing the proposals and to expect the agencies to ask the Commission "what to do?" Dr. Everett cautioned that agencies could come with a rule or restriction against a proposal and ask the same type question.

Mr. Howard said there were some major projects such as the ones mentioned by Dr. Riggs that could benefit from an additional review. He argued that there were mechanisms in place which provide the additional review for those sizable projects, but there are hundreds of projects, he said, that would be held up by this process.

#### *7. Resolution in Support of Federal Climate Change Legislation.*

Mr. Glaser and Ms. Choi discussed the issues of avoiding patchwork regulations and requested that the preemption language in the draft resolution be removed so as to allow more uniform national standards. Chair Harrison indicated that the question of preemption was an important issue to her and would like to see the language remain in the draft proposal.

Returning to the discussion of the first legislative proposal and the issue of an advisory council to the permanent Commission, Mr. Urlaub felt that the North Carolina Sustainable Energy Association should be represented. Co-Chair Harrison said that the

field of public health should be included, and Ms. Tompkins agreed. Dr. Eggers said that there should be someone with knowledge in biodiversity and ecosystem function. Mr. Hudson said that the Commission would have the authority to contact and bring in any experts it needs.

Dr. Riggs closed out the discussion by saying that the work reflected in the draft had been an “incredibly good effort.”

Mr. Dodge urged that any additional material coming to staff should be received by April 14<sup>th</sup>. The report for discussion at the May 6<sup>th</sup> meeting would go out to the members on April 30th.

The meeting adjourned at 1:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Representative Pricey Harrison, Co-Chair

---

Thelma Utley, Commission Clerk

---

Mr. John Garrou, Co-Chair, Presiding

---

Minutes by Ted Harrison,  
Commission Clerk

**ADDENDUM:**

In addition to the attachments associated with the presentations by Mr. Hinton and Ms Lascurain, the following materials are also attached.

1. Letter with comments from Ms. Carolina Choi and Dr. George Everett
2. Memo from Dr. Smith
3. Comments from Mr. Robert Slocum
4. Letter from Mr. Robert Glaser
5. Note from Richard Andrews
6. Memo from Mitch Peele
7. Meme from Michael Regan
8. Note from Dr. Dee Eggers
9. Unsigned note from DENR Air Quality
10. Note from Ms. Susan Tompkins
11. Memo from Todd Miller
12. Suggestions from Dr. Stan Riggs